

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 5-11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eloranta, WO 01/60098 A1) in view of Nieminen, WO 02/084985 A1 and further in view of Lu, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0009991. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner admits that Eloranta fails to teach that the identification detail is associated with at least one identification detail abbreviation relating to the subscriber. The Examiner asserts that Nieminen discloses that identification detail is associated with at least one identification detail abbreviation relating to the subscriber at pg. 6, lines 10-17 and pg. 7, lines 5-27. The Examiner considers that the expression “+35840” specifies a group of numbers all of which begin +35840, such as +3584012345 and +3584098765, which is referred to as using wildcards, or abbreviations.

According to the claimed invention, the use of such abbreviated data provides the advantage that the number of list entries in the database can be significantly reduced. This is in particular advantageous if a high number of telecommunication subscribers are supposed to be monitored.

Nieminen discloses a communication system for providing services to communication terminals, which correspond to subscribers. Such a service may be, for instance, providing a weather forecast or transmitting emails to a user’s mobile station. A service data storage unit is used for storing a set of service provision definitions. Each service provision definition comprises a service field storing an indication of a service and an address field storing an expression specifying the address of one or more of the terminals. According to Nieminen, wildcards may be used in order to specify more than one subscriber number (see page 6, second paragraph). A service logic unit is arranged to receive communications in the system and compares an address specified in a communication with the expressions stored in the address field of each of the service provision

definitions. Based on that comparison, the service provision unit provides the desired service to the terminal respectively to the plurality of terminals identified by that address.

While Eloranta relates to the same technical field as the claimed invention, namely the technical field of selectively legally monitoring suspicious parties within a communication network, Nieminen relates to a completely different technical field, namely selective service access by authorized users, and is silent about monitoring a data connection. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Eloranta in view of Nieminen.

Further, even if combined, the combination of these references would not result in the claimed invention. When monitoring a data communication of a suspicious user, automatically both the information received by this user and the information transmitted by this user is monitored. By contrast thereto, when selectively providing services to authorized users it is only necessary to allow information flowing from a service provider towards the user. Even if it is, in principle, possible information flows from the user, Nieminen is silent about establishing such a two-sided communication where information flows both in the direction towards and in the direction away from the selected user. Further, Nieminen does not teach or suggest that wildcards can be used for a two-sided communication. In fact, one of ordinary skill in the art would not use wildcards for deciding whether the communication of a suspicious party has been intercepted.

Further, when combining Eloranta and Nieminen, it has to be further taken into account that when providing data access to at least one user by employing a wildcard, all users fulfilling the corresponding criterion will be automatically provided with the same service. In contrast, when monitoring a plurality of users having an identification detail, which corresponds to a certain identification detail abbreviation, all these users, together with their counterparts, will be monitored separately. Therefore, using a wildcard according to Nieminen would cause all selected users to be treated collectively in the same way as all other selected users. In contrast, using an abbreviation according to the claimed invention causes all selected users to be treated individually by monitoring

all information flowing to and from these selected users separately. Therefore, Nieminen teaches a person skilled in the art that using a wildcard will only allow for a collective treatment of selected users. However, this is definitely not the case when selected telecommunication connections are supposed to be intercepted. Hence, a person skilled in the art would not apply the concept of using wildcards for deciding whether the communication of a suspicious party has to be intercepted.

Still further, even when combining these references, a person skilled in the art would not exploit the concept of wildcards for deciding which data connection has to be monitored.

According to Nieminen, a user, whose identity corresponds to a database entry including a wildcard, is allowed to take benefit from special services offered by a service provider. By contrast thereto, a third party, namely the official intercepting center, exploits the fact that the identity of a user corresponds to an identification detail abbreviation representing a plurality of identification details.

However, even if all of these references were combined, such a combination would not make the use of identification detail abbreviations obvious for the technical field of intercepting telecommunication connection. As can be derived from paragraph [0171] of the reference Lu, abbreviation of International Mobile Subscriber Identity (IMSI) data is used to uniquely identify a mobile station. Therefore the term "abbreviation" used in Lu has a completely different technical meaning than the term "abbreviation" used the present invention as described with independent claims 1 and 11. According to the claimed invention, an abbreviation is used for pooling a plurality of different suspicious subscribers in order to allow for using a smaller database and for achieving a faster comparison of whether the communication of a particular subscriber has to be intercepted.

According to Lu, abbreviations are simply used for shortening identification codes, wherein the one-to-one relationship between the original code and the abbreviated code is maintained.

Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eloranta in view of Nieminen, in view of Lu, and further in view of Helferich, U.S. Patent No. 6,826,407. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3 and 4 are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies and further in view of Helferich's failure to overcome the deficiencies of Eloranta, Nieminen and Lu. Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 44912-2082300.

Dated: February 26, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Deborah S. Gladstein
Deborah S. Gladstein

Registration No.: 43,636
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7753